UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/687,533	10/16/2003	Georg Mayer	944-4.38	7746

7590 11/02/2005	EXAMINER

Ware, Fressola, Van Der Sluys and Adolphson, LLP
Five Bradford Green Building
755 Main Street
P. O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, QUANG N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action **Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**	Application No. *10/687,533*	Applicant(s) MAYER ET AL.	
	Examiner Quang N. Nguyen	Art Unit 2141	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED <u>11 October 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

   a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

     Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

<u>NOTICE OF APPEAL</u>

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

<u>AMENDMENTS</u>

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because

   (a)☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b)☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

   (c)☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d)☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

     NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

   Claim(s) allowed: *None*.

   Claim(s) objected to: *None*.

   Claim(s) rejected: *1,3-6 and 8-11*.

   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: *None*.

<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

<u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u>

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

   See attachement..

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

13. ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

1.   This Office Action is in response to the Response to Final Office Action filed on

10/11/2005. Claims 1, 3-6 and 8-11 remain for examination.

Drawings

2.   The drawings were received on 08/04/2005. These drawings are acceptable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   **Claims 1, 3-6 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over G. Camarillo (RFC 3486 – Compressing the Session Initiation

Protocol), in view of Bergenlid et al. (US 2003/0156578 A1), hereafter referred as

Bergenlid.

5.   As to claims 1 and 4, Camarillo teaches a method by which a UE (user

equipment) device begins compressing messages it transmits to an SIP outbound proxy

server, comprising:

the UE device sends a request message to the SIP outbound proxy server *(the*

client sends an uncompressed OPTIONS request message to its outbound proxy

server); (Camarillo, section 4.1, paragraph 4); and

the UE device analyzes a response message received from the SIP outbound

proxy server in response to the request message to determine an allowed form of

compression *(i.e., to determine a compression parameter)* for use in compressing

messages it sends to the SIP outbound proxy server *(the outbound proxy server can*

provide an alternative SIP URI with the compression parameter "comp=sigcomp" in a

Contact header field in a 200 OK response to the OPTIONS request message and the

client can use this URI with the compression parameter "comp=sigcomp" for

subsequent communications with this outbound proxy server using compression)

(Camarillo, section 4.1, paragraph 4).

However, Camarillo but does not explicitly teach wherein the request message is

a register message and wherein the response message is a 401 (unauthorized)

message.

In a related art, Bergenlid teaches a system and method for packet-based

conversation service for a multimedia session in a mobile communications system,

wherein the Mobile Terminal (MT) <u>sends a SIP Register message</u> via the primary PDP

context and corresponding bearers to the IP Multimedia System (IMS 36) and the IMS

36 <u>responds with a SIP 401 Unauthorized message</u>, if the user is not registered, the 401 message is sent to the user including a challenge (Bergenlid, paragraph [0048]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Camarillo and Bergenlid to include the request message is a register message, and the response message is a 401 (unauthorized) message since such methods were conventionally employed in the art to allow the system to detect, challenge and identify authorized/unauthorized subscribers (mobile terminals or users) before initiating a communications session.

6.   As to claim 3, Camarillo-Bergenlid teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the UE device alters an address for the SIP outbound proxy server previously stored so as to include the stored address with the compression parameter *(i.e., adding/appending the compression parameter to the address such as sip:alice@Atlanta.com; comp=sigcomp)* (Camarillo, section 2).

7.   As to claim 5, Camarillo-Bergenlid teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the response message is any compressed message *(since the UAC supports "SigComp", which is contained in the "Via" header field, i.e., indicating the response has to be compressed using SigComp)* (Camarillo, section 2).

8.   Claims 6 and 8-10 are corresponding apparatus claims of method claims 1 and 3-5; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

9.   Claim 11 is a corresponding program computer product claim of method claim 1;

therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

10.   In the remarks, Applicant argued in substance that

(A)   Prior Arts do not teach or suggest, "the UE device examining a response

to a request message in order to determine what compression technique is supported

by an SIP outbound proxy", as recited in claim 1.

As to point **(A)**, **Camarillo** teaches a client sending an uncompressed request

message to its outbound proxy, ***the outbound proxy server can provide*** an

alternative SIP URI with ***the compression parameter "comp=sigcomp"*** in a Contact

header field in a 200 OK response message to the request message and the client can

use this URI with the compression parameter "comp=sigcomp" for subsequent

communications with this outbound proxy server using compression *(inherently, the*

client, i.e., the UE device, examines/recognizes the compression parameter

"comp=sigcomp" in the Contact header filed in the 200 OK response message to

determine what compression technique supported by the outbound proxy server)

(Camarillo, section 4.1).

11.   Applicant's arguments as well as request for reconsideration filed on 10/11/2005

have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

12.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Quang N. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571)

272-3886.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

SPE, Rupal Dharia, can be reached at (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the

organization is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER